

*Compliments
J.J.*

DOCUMENT No. II.

The Defender

DEVOTED TO THE PROTECTION OF AMERICAN LABOR AND INDUSTRIES.

THE AMERICAN PROTECTIVE TARIFF LEAGUE,

No. 339 Broadway, Between Worth and Leonard Sts.

NEW YORK, 1912.

ABRAHAM LINCOLN ON THE TARIFF.

THE GREAT EMANCIPATOR A FIRM BELIEVER IN

THE POLICY OF PROTECTION

TO AMERICAN LABOR AND INDUSTRY.

Extracts from Lincoln's Speeches and Writings on the Tariff.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY

HON. WILBUR F. WAKEMAN

At the Seventh Annual Lincoln Dinner of the Sullivan County
(N. Y.) Republicans, at Liberty, February 12, 1912.

ADDRESS DELIVERED BY

HON. WILBUR F. WAKEMAN

At the Seventh Annual Lincoln Dinner of the Sullivan County
(N. Y.) Republicans, at Liberty, February 12, 1912.

Mr. Toastmaster and Gentlemen:—

On occasions of this kind I am expected to speak on the Tariff question. I shall speak on the Tariff question. What is the Tariff? A Protective Tariff represents a tax on imports from foreign countries. Many people have said that the Tariff is not a tax. It is a tax. It is a tax on the products of foreign nations. The Protective Tariff is a principle based on a national system of Protective Tariff duties. You can split a price, but you cannot split a principle. Understand, please, if I come to you and want to buy a given article, I ask you the price; you reply that the price is one hundred dollars. I say to you I will give you ninety dollars. We compromise and you sell me the article for ninety-five dollars. But you can't split a principle. Honesty is a principle. You can't be 90 per cent. honest. If you are honest you must be 100 per cent. honest; and so with the principle of Protection. You must be 100 per cent. a Protectionist, or you are something else.

The Lincoln Day dinner, of which this is a splendid example, has become a national celebration, and it seems appropriate that my remarks should be based on

The Position of Abraham Lincoln on
the Tariff Question.

Mr. Lincoln has been quoted in all kinds of ways in connection with the Tariff, and for years I tried to get his original expressions on this subject. After the most careful examination running over a period of years, and after communication with his son, the Hon. Robert T. Lincoln, I think I am safe in saying that Mr. Lincoln's original views on the subject of a Protective Tariff were as follows:

Abraham Lincoln delivered his first political speech in 1832, when a candidate for the Legislature of Illinois. It was as follows:

"Gentlemen, Fellow-Citizens: I presume you know who I am. I am humble Abraham Lincoln. I have been solicited by many friends to become a candidate for the Legislature. My politics can be briefly stated. I am in favor of the internal improvement system and a high Protective Tariff. These are my sentiments and political principles. If elected, I shall be thankful; if not, it will be all the same."

Abraham Lincoln and Protection.

On February 15, 1861, President-elect Lincoln addressed a large concourse of people at Pittsburgh, Pa. Among other things he said:

Fellow citizens, as this is the first opportunity I have had to address a Pennsylvania assemblage, it seems a fitting time to indulge in a few remarks on the important question of the Tariff, a subject of great magnitude, and one attended with many difficulties, owing to the great variety of interests involved. So long as direct taxation for the support of the Government is not resorted to a Tariff is necessary. A Tariff is to the Government what meat is to a family; but while this is admitted, it still becomes necessary to modify or change its operations, according as new interests or new circumstances arise. So far, there is little difference of opinion among politicians, but the question as to how far imports may be adjusted for the Protection of home industry gives rise to numerous views and objections. Permit me, fellow-citizens, to read the Tariff plank of the Chicago platform, or rather, have it read in your hearing by one who has younger eyes than I have.

Mr. Lincoln's private secretary then read Section 12 of the Chicago platform, as follows:

That while providing revenue for the support of the general Government by duties upon imports, sound policy requires such an adjustment of these imports as may encourage the development of the industrial interests of the whole country; and we commend the policy of national exchanges, which secures to the workingmen liberal wages, to agriculture remunerating prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor and enterprise, and to the nation commercial prosperity and independence.

Protection for all Productive Industry.

Mr. Lincoln continued:

Now, I must confess that there are

shades of difference in construing even this platform, but I am not now intending to discuss these differences, but merely to give you some general ideas of the subject. I have long thought that if there be any article of necessity which can be produced at home, with as little or nearly the same labor as abroad, it would be better to Protect that article of labor at its true standard of value. If a bar of iron, got out of the mines of England, a bar of iron taken from the mines of Pennsylvania, can be produced at the same cost, it follows that if the English bar be shipped from Manchester to Pittsburgh, and the American bar from Pittsburgh to Manchester, the cost of carriage is appreciably lost. (Laughter). If we had no iron here, then we should encourage the shipment from a foreign country, but not when we can make it as cheaply in our own country. This brings us back to the first proposition, that if any article can be produced at home with nearly the same cost as abroad, the carriage is lost labor. The treasury of the nation is in such a low condition at present that this subject now demands the attention of Congress, and will demand the immediate consideration of the new administration. If I have any recommendation to make it will be that every man who is called upon to serve the people in a representative capacity should study the whole subject thoroughly, as I intend to do myself, looking to the varied interests of the common country, so that when the time for action arrives to advocate that Protection may be extended to the coal and iron of Pennsylvania, the corn of Illinois and the reapers of Chicago.

The following selections from the complete works of Abraham Lincoln were written by him between his elec-

tion to Congress in 1846 and taking his seat in December, 1847:

Mr. Lincoln's Notations.

"Whether the Protective policy shall be finally abandoned is now the question. Discussion and experience already had, and question now in greater dispute than ever. Has there not been some great error in the mode of discussion? Propose a single issue of fact, namely: From 1816 to the present, have Protected articles cost us more of labor during the higher than during the lower duties upon them? Introduce the evidence. Analyze this issue, and try to show that it embraces the true and whole question of the Protective policy. Intended as a test of experience. The period selected is fair, because it is a period of peace—a period sufficiently long (to) furnish a fair average under all other causes operating on prices, a period in which various modifications of higher and lower duties have occurred. Protected articles only are embraced. Show that these only belong to the question. The labor price only is embraced. Show this to be correct.

Effect of Duties Upon Prices.

"I suppose the true effect of duties upon prices to be as follows: If a certain duty be levied upon an article which by nature cannot be produced in this country, as three cents a pound upon coffee, the effect will be that the consumer will pay one cent more per pound than before, the producer will take one cent less in profits; in other words, the burden of the duty will (be) distributed over consumption, production and commerce, and not confined to either. But if a duty amounting to full Protection be levied upon an article which can be produced here with as little labor as elsewhere, as iron, that

article will ultimately and at no distant day, in consequence of such duty, be sold to our people cheaper than before, at least, by the amount of the cost of carrying it from abroad.

Useless Labor.

"First as to useless labor. Before proceeding, however, it may be as well to give a specimen of what I conceive to be useless labor. I say, then, that all carrying, and incidents of carrying, of articles from the place of their production to a distant place for consumption, which articles could be produced of as good quality, in sufficient quantity and with as little labor at the place of consumption as at the place carried from, is useless labor. Applying this principle to our country by an example, let us suppose that A and B are a Pennsylvania farmer and a Pennsylvania iron maker, whose lands are adjoining. Under the Protective policy A is furnishing B with bread and meat, and vegetables and fruits, and food for horses and oxen, and fresh supplies of horses and oxen themselves occasionally, and receiving in exchange all the iron, iron utensils, tools and implements he needs. In this process of exchange each receives the whole of that which the other parts with, and the reward of labor between them is perfect; each receiving the product of just so much labor as he has himself bestowed on what he parts with for it. But the change comes. The Protective policy is abandoned, and A determines to buy his iron and iron manufactures of C in Europe. This he can only do by a direct or an indirect exchange of the produce of his farm for them. We will suppose the direct exchange is adopted. In this A desires to exchange ten barrels of flour—the precise product of one hundred days' labor—for the largest quantity of iron, etc., that he can get. C

also wishes to exchange the precise product, in iron, of one hundred days' labor for the greatest quantity of flour he can get. In intrinsic value the things to be exchanged are precisely equal.

Wasteful Transportation.

"But before this exchange can take place the flour must be carried from Pennsylvania to England and the iron from England to Pennsylvania. The flour starts. The wagoner who hauls it to Philadelphia takes a part of it for his labor; then a merchant there takes a little more for storage and forwarding commission, and another takes a little more for insurance; and then the shipowner carries it across the water and takes a little more of it for his trouble. Still, before it reaches C it is tolled two or three times more for storage, drayage, commission, and so on; so when C gets it there are but seven and a half barrels of it left. The iron, too, in its transit from England to Pennsylvania goes through the same process of tolling, so that when it reaches A there are but three quarters of it left. The result of this case is that A and C have each parted with one hundred days' labor, and each received but seventy-five in return. That the carrying in this case was introduced by A ceasing to buy of B and turning to C; that it was utterly useless, and that it is ruinous in its effects upon A, are all little less than self-evident. "But," asks one, "if A is now only getting three-quarters as much iron from C for ten barrels of flour as he used to get of B, why does he not turn back to B?" The answer is: "B has quit making iron, and so has none to sell." "But why did B quit making?" "Because A quit buying of him, and he had no other customer to sell to." "But, surely, A did not cease buying of B with the

expectation of buying of C on harder terms?" Certainly not. Let me tell you how that was. When B was making iron as well as C, B had but one customer, this farmer A; C had four customers in Europe."

Falsity of the "Cheapest Market" Theory.

It seems to be an opinion very generally entertained that the condition of a nation is best whenever it can buy cheapest; but this is not necessarily true, because if, at the same time and by the same cause, it is compelled to sell correspondingly cheap, nothing is gained. Then it is said the best condition is when we can buy cheapest and sell dearest; but this again is not necessarily true, because with both these we might have scarcely anything to sell, or, which is the same thing, to buy with. To illustrate this, suppose a man in the present state of things is laboring the year round, at ten dollars per month, which amounts in the year to \$120. A change in affairs enables him to buy supplies at half the former price, to get fifty dollars per month for his labor, but at the same time deprives him of employment during all the months of the year but one. In this case, though goods have fallen one-half, and labor risen five to one, it is still plain that at the end of the year the laborer is twenty dollars poorer than under the old state of things.

Value of Constant Employment.

These reflections show that to reason and act correctly on this subject we must look not merely to buying cheap, nor yet to buying cheap and selling dear, but also to having constant employment, so that we may have the largest possible amount of something to sell. This matter of employment

can only be secured by an ample, steady, and certain market to sell the products of our labor in.

But let us yield the point, and admit that by abandoning the Protective policy our farmers can purchase their supplies of manufactured articles cheaper than by continuing it; and then let us see whether, even at that, they will upon the whole be gainers by the change. To simplify this question, let us suppose the whole agricultural interest of the country to be in the hands of one man, who has one hundred laborers in his employ; the whole manufacturing interest to be in the hands of one other man, who has twenty laborers in his employ. The farmer owns all the plowed and pasture land, and the manufacturer all the iron mines and coal banks and sites of water power. Each is pushing on his own way, and obtaining supplies from the other so far as he needs—that is, the manufacturer is buying of the farmer all the cotton he can use in his cotton factory; all the wool he can use in his woolen establishment; all the bread and meats as well as all the fruits and vegetables which are necessary for himself and all his hands in all his departments; all the corn and oats and hay which are necessary for all his horses and oxen, as well as fresh supplies of horses and oxen themselves to do all his heavy hauling about his iron works and generally of every sort. The farmer in turn is buying of the manufacturer all the iron, iron tools, wooden tools, cotton goods, woolen goods, etc., that he needs in his business and for his hands.

Must Have Something to Buy With.

But after a while the farmer discovers that were it not for the PROTECTIVE policy he could buy all of these supplies cheaper from a European manufacturer, owing to the fact that

the price of labor is only one-quarter as high there as here. He and his hands are a majority of the whole, and, therefore, have the legal and moral right to have their interest first consulted. They throw off the Protective policy, the farmer ceases buying of the home manufacturer. Very soon, however, he discovers that to buy even at the cheaper rate requires something to buy with, and somehow or other he is falling down on this particular.

All Things Belong to Labor.

In the early days of our race the Almighty said to the first of our race, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread"; and since then, if we expect the light and the air of heaven, no good thing has been or can be enjoyed by us without having first cost labor. And, inasmuch, as most good things are produced by labor, it follows that all such things of right belong to those whose labor has produced them. But it has so happened in all the ages of the world that some have labored and others have without labor enjoyed a large proportion of the fruits. This is wrong, and should not continue. To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, or as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any good government.

How Can Government Help?

But then, a question arises. How can a government best effect this? In our own country, in its present condition, will the Protective principle advance or retard this object? Upon this subject the habits of our whole species fall into three great classes—useful labor, useless labor and idleness. On these the first only is meritorious, and to it all the products of labor rightfully belong; but the two latter, while they exist, are heavy pensioners upon the first, robbing it of a large portion of its

just rights. The only remedy for this is to, so far as possible, drive useless labor and idleness out of existence. And first, as to useless labor. Before making war upon this, we must learn to distinguish it from the useful. It appears to me that all labor done directly and indirectly in carrying articles to the place of consumption, which could have been produced in sufficient abundance, with as little labor, at the place of consumption as at the place they were carried from, is useless labor.

Needless Labor in Carrying.

Let us take a few examples of the application of this principle to our own country. Iron and everything made of iron can be produced in sufficient abundance, and with as little labor in the United States as anywhere else in the world, therefore, all labor done in bringing iron and its fabrics from a foreign country to the United States is useless labor. The same precisely may be said of cotton, wool and of their fabrics, respectively, as well as many other articles. While the uselessness of the carrying labor is equally true of all the articles mentioned, and of many others not mentioned, it is perhaps more glaringly obvious in relation to the cotton goods we purchase from abroad. The raw cotton from which they are made itself grows in our own country, is carried by land and by water to England, is there spun, wove, dyed, stamped, etc., and then carried back again and worn in the very country where it grew, and partly by the very persons who grew it. Why should it not be spun, wove, etc., in the very neighborhood where it grows and is consumed, and the carrying thereby dispensed with? Has nature interposed any obstacle? Are not all the agents—animal power, water power and steam power—as good and as abundant here as elsewhere? Will not as small an amount of human labor

answer here as elsewhere? We may easily see that the cost of this useless labor is very heavy. It includes not only the cost of actual carriage, but also the insurance of every kind, and the profits of the merchants through whose hands it passes. All these create a heavy burden falling upon the useful labor connected with such articles, either depressing the price to the producer or advancing it to the consumer, or, what is more probable, doing both in part.

Cotton as an Illustration.

A supposed case will serve to illustrate several points now to the purpose. A, in the interior of South Carolina, has one hundred pounds of cotton, which we suppose to be the precise product of one man's labor for twenty days. B, in Manchester, England, has one hundred yards of cotton cloth, the precise product of the same amount of labor. This lot of cotton and lot of cotton cloth are precisely equal to each other in their intrinsic value. But A wishes to part with his cotton for the largest quantity of cloth he can get. B also wishes to part with his cloth for the greatest quantity of cotton he can get. An exchange is, therefore, necessary; but before this can be effected the cotton must be carried to Manchester and the cloth to South Carolina.

To Manchester and Back.

The cotton starts to Manchester. The man that hauls it to Charleston in his wagon takes a little of it to pay him for his trouble; the merchant who stores it awhile before the ship is ready to sail takes a little out for his trouble; the shipowner who carries it across the water takes a little out for his trouble. Still, before it gets to Manchester it is tolled two or three times more for dray-

age, storage, commission, and so on, so that when it reaches B's hands there are but seventy-five pounds of it left. The cloth, too, in its transit from Manchester to South Carolina goes through the same process of tolling, so that when it reaches A there are but seventy-five yards of it left. Now, in this case, A and B each have parted with twenty days' labor, and each received but fifteen in return. But let us suppose that B has removed to the side of A's farm in South Carolina, and has there made his lot of cloth. Is it not clear that he and A can then exchange their cloth and cotton, each getting the whole of what the other parts with?

Imposes a Direct Burden.

This supposed case shows the utter uselessness of the carrying labor in all similar cases, and also the direct burden it imposes upon useful labor. And whoever will take up the train of reflection suggested by this case and run it out to the full extent of its just application, will be astonished at the amount of useless labor he will thus discover to be done in this very way. I am mistaken if it is not in fact many times over equal to all the real want in the world. This useless labor I would have discontinued, and those engaged in it added to the class of useful laborers. If I be asked whether I would destroy all commerce, I answer, Certainly not; I would continue it where it is necessary and discontinue it where it is not. An instance: I would continue commerce so far as it is employed in bringing us coffee, and I would discontinue it so far as it is employed in bringing us cotton goods.

Would the Farmer Be the Gainer?

But let us yield the point and admit by abandoning the Protective policy our farmers can purchase their supplies

of manufactured articles cheaper than before; and then let us see whether, even at that, the farmers will upon the whole be gainers by the change. To simplify this question, let us suppose our whole population to consist of but twenty men. Under the prevalence of the Protective policy, fifteen of these are farmers, one is a miller, one manufactures iron, one implements from iron, one cotton goods, and one woolen goods. The farmers discover that, owing to labor only costing one-quarter as much in Europe as here, they can buy iron, iron implements, cotton goods and woolen goods cheaper when brought from Europe than when made by their neighbors. They are the majority, and therefore have both the legal and moral right to have their interest first consulted. They throw off the Protective policy and cease buying these articles of their neighbors. But they soon discover that to buy, and at the cheaper rate, requires something to buy with.

Nothing Doing at the Furnace.

Falling short in this particular, one of the farmers takes a load of wheat to the miller and gets it made into flour, and starts, as has been his custom, to the iron furnace. He approaches the well-known spot, but, strange to say, all is cold and still as death; no smoke rises, no furnace roars, no anvil rings.

After some search he finds the owner of the desolate place and calls out to him: "Come, Vulcan, don't you want to buy a load of flour?"

"Why," says Vulcan, "I am hungry enough, to be sure; haven't tasted bread for a week, but then you see my works are stopped and I have nothing to give you for your flour."

"But, Vulcan, why don't you go to work and get something?"

"I am ready to do so; will you hire me, farmer?"

"Oh, no; I could only set you to raising wheat; and you see I have more of that already than I can get anything for."

"But give me employment and send your flour to Europe for a market."

"Why, Vulcan; how silly you talk. Don't you know they raise wheat in Europe as well as here, and labor is so cheap there as to fix the price of flour there so low as scarcely to pay the long carriage of it from here, leaving nothing whatever to me?"

"But, farmer, couldn't you pay to raise and prepare gardenstuffs and fruits, such as radishes, cabbages, Irish and sweet potatoes, cucumbers, water-melons and muskmelons, plums, pears, peaches, apples, and the like? All these are good things and used to sell well."

"So they did use to sell well, but it was to you we sold them, and now you tell us you have nothing to buy with. Of course, I cannot sell such things to the other farmers, because each of them raises enough for himself, and, in fact, rather wishes to sell than to buy. Neither can I send them to Europe for a market, because, to say nothing of European markets being stocked with such articles at lower prices than I can afford, they are of such a nature as to rot before they could reach there. The truth is, Vulcan, I am compelled to quit raising these things altogether, except a few for my own use, and this leaves part of my own time idle on my hands, instead of my finding employment for you."

Useless Labor as Bad as Idleness.

If at any time all labor should cease and all existing provisions be equally divided among the people, at the end of a single year there could scarcely be one human being left alive; all would have perished by want of subsistence. So, again, if upon such division all that

sort of labor which produces provisions should cease, and each individual should take up so much of his share as he could and carry it continually around his habitation, although in this carrying the amount of labor going on might be as great as ever, so long as it could last, at the end of the year the result would be precisely the same—that is, none would be left living.

The first of these propositions shows that universal idleness would speedily result in universal ruin, and the second shows that useless labor is, in this respect, the same as idleness. I submit, then, whether it does not follow that partial idleness and partial useless labor would, in the proportion of their extent, in like manner result in partial ruin; whether, if all should subsist upon the labor that one-half should perform, it would not result in very scanty allowance to the whole.

Believing that these propositions and the conclusions I draw from them cannot be successfully controverted, I for the present assume their correctness, and proceed to try to show that the abandonment of the Protective policy by the American Government must result in the increase of both useless labor and idleness, and so, in proportion, must produce want and ruin among our people.

It seems to me that if these thoughts expressed by our great Emancipator could be placed in the hands of every voter of this country, there would be little question of the judgment of the people in regard to the Tariff. Following the thoughts expressed by Mr. Lincoln, I want to tell you what I found in an old scrapbook regarding the opinion of Napoleon Bonaparte after his retreat from Moscow:

What Happens to a Nation Without Sheep.

Napoleon Bonaparte, chewing the bitter cud of reflection upon the horrors of the disastrous winter campaign in Russia, when his soldiers perished by thousands for lack of warm clothing, is said to have exclaimed: "Spain has twenty-five millions of merino sheep. I wish that France had a hundred million!" If France had had a hundred million sheep, the story of that terrible retreat from Moscow need never have been written.

The United States has about fifty-seven million sheep. I wish we had three times fifty-seven million sheep. Then we should be independent of foreign supply; then we should have enough wool to clothe our population of one hundred million; then we should have three times the present supply of mutton, which would go far toward solving the troublesome problem of high cost of food supplies.—From the letter of A. D. Juilliard to the Convention of the National Wool Growers' Association at Portland, Ore.

Napoleon also said:

If a nation was made of adamant it would be crushed into powder by Free Trade.

View of an English Protectionist.

In the same line of thought I wish to quote a sentence from the writings of Sir John Banard Byles, an eminent English economist, delivered in 1857:

A nation, whether it consume its own productions, or with them purchase from abroad, can have no more to spend than it produces. Therefore, the supreme policy of every nation is to develop its own producing forces.

Great Britain has followed the Tariff-for-revenue-only or Free Trade policy since 1845, and is perhaps the best illustration of the Free Trade policy in the world. The United States has heretofore adhered and in the future will adhere to the Protective policy. Great Britain collects a great deal of revenue from the Tariff, but the Tariff in Great Britain is applied to non-competitive articles like tea, coffee, wine, spirits, etc. Only twelve articles entering Great Britain are dutiable. In the United States we apply Protective Tariff duties to all articles of foreign commerce which compete with domestic production, and as you know, about one-half of our entire revenue for the support of the government is obtained from the Tariff. Strange as it may seem, however, in Great Britain which is considered a Free Trade country, they collect from Tariff duties, about eighty cents per capita yearly, more than we do in this country. Nearly all of the duties collected in Great Britain are a direct tax upon the consumer, because their tariff duties apply to non-competitive products, whereas in this country our duties apply to competitive products only. To illustrate: In Great Britain the largest amount of Tariff duties are collected from tea and coffee. In the United States both of these commodities are free of duty, because we do not produce them.

Our Country Should do its Own Work.

The Protective Tariff means that

this country, in all industries, shall do its own work. By doing our own work we provide the opportunity of employment in every industry. This means complete diversification of industry, and through the employment thus furnished we pay the highest wages in the world. Our Protective Tariff, in effect, during the entire history of the country, with two exceptions, has made this country the envy of the civilized world.

There Should be no Adjectives.

Last week I was down to Washington and called on a United States Senator who is now serving his third term. Said he: "Hello, what kind of a Protectionist are you?" I replied: "I am a Protectionist." Said he: "I am glad to meet a Protectionist who doesn't use an adjective or an adverb." We are suffering from adjectives and adverbs; that is, one person will say he is a "high Protectionist"; another person will say he is a "qualified Protectionist"; another person will say he is for "a Tariff for revenue only." We can meet the enemy without fear, if we stand together.

During the pacification of the different tribes in the Philippines, there were seven tribes which gave a great deal of trouble. These seven tribes would not come together. Chiefs of these tribes individually said: "Let the Yankees come on and we will deal with them"; with the result that our army destroyed one tribe at a time and thus secured victory. If, however,

the seven tribes had stood together, worked together and fought together, it would have taken an army many times as great as we had in the Philippines to subdue the hostile tribes and bring the entire people under the control of our Government.

Present Day Attacks on Protection.

Now, in the last few years the Protective Tariff system has been attacked in many ways. It was weakened by the Cuban treaty of 1903. It was attacked by the German Trade agreement of 1907. It has been attacked by the Canadian trade agreement, which has resulted in only one point of Free Trade, namely, in paper. It was attacked last summer by the Underwood Wool and Cotton bill. It is now being attacked by bills affecting individual schedules: by the Underwood Iron and Steel Bill passed by the House of Representatives on January 31, and now before the United States Senate; it will be attacked in a few days by a bill affecting chemicals; again, by a new Cotton bill; by a Free Sugar bill and by a new Woolen bill.

My point in calling attention to the present condition is to impress upon you the necessity of Protectionists standing together. I do not believe in sending documents and printed matter to Free Traders. Some years ago one of our best friends came to me and said: "Here is a list of about one thousand Free Traders. Send your literature to them. Find out the

effect if you can." We did so, and checked up the returns as carefully as we could. I don't think that one out of the thousand became a Protectionist. People are not made Protectionists by cold type; but Mr. A. goes to Mr. B. and says: "Mr. B., I have looked into this thing; I know I am right. Have you?" "No." That personal connection, that personal friendship, will make a Protectionist; and, as I said before, if this company here to-night will stand together as one man, banded together in confidence, faith, loyalty and devotion to the cause which protects our industries and labor, you may have no fear as to the future.

Tribute to Thomas W. Bradley.

In the course of his address Mr. Wakeman paid a deserved tribute to a tried and true Protectionist, as follows:

With your permission, Mr. Toastmaster, I wish to offer a toast. I wish to offer a toast to a Protectionist. I wish to offer a toast to a Protectionist who in the State of New York was possibly more responsible than any other one man for the nomination of William McKinley for President of the United States in 1896. In offering this toast I quote from a personal letter dated December 21, 1895, as follows:

. . . Try the oil of conciliation and compromise; at same time using

your utmost endeavor to secure second choice (or first choice, in reality, if it is more politic) McKinley men as delegates. This is the plan with "us fellows" in country districts; I'm not the only McKinley would-be delegate in up-country districts keeping his mouth closed at present but expecting to win all the same at the finish. . . .

"I want to do for Gov. McKinley all that is in me to do."

In proposing this toast I also wish to say that in the spring of 1896 this gentleman was elected as a delegate to the Republican National Convention, and after his election as delegate he informed me that he should vote for William McKinley as the nominee of the Republican party first, last and all the time. This gentleman was one of the first men to hail William McKinley as the "advance agent of prosperity." This gentleman broke the New York delegation and in my judgment was largely responsible for the nomination of William McKinley in 1896.

I propose, Mr. Toastmaster, a toast to a man who has been taken away from you by the recent Democratic gerrymander of the State of New York, but who is still with you, and, if re-elected from his new district, will represent you as loyally and as faithfully as he has heretofore; and my toast is to Hon. Thomas W. Bradley, Representative, Twentieth District of the State of New York.

A PROTECTION DECALOGUE.

In Germany they know what Protection is and should be. They don't worry over there about trusts and combinations, except to encourage and help them. They don't complain if German goods are sold abroad cheaper than at home, but are glad of it, for thereby Germany's foreign trade is extended and Germany's labor is employed. There are no Tariff-for-revenue politics in Germany; no Insurgents worrying about "the interests" and losing sleep because German industry is too profitable and somebody is making money too fast. Neither does Germany sell out her farmers by letting in cheaper products from other countries without paying duties; on the contrary, her agricultural Tariff schedules are the highest of all her schedules.

There are many things in Germany's economic and industrial policy which might with advantage be studied and imitated in the United States. For example, the new "Ten Commandments" (made in Germany) which have been printed as a pamphlet and are being circulated by the million copies throughout the Fatherland. They breathe a spirit of intense patriotism—in the commercial sense—and distrust of foreign products. Here is the new German decalogue:

I. In spending money, however small the amount, never lose sight of the interests of your compatriots and country.

II. Do not forget that when you buy

an article from a foreign country, even though it may cost a copper coin, you diminish to that extent the wealth of your country.

III. Your money ought only to benefit German merchants and workmen.

IV. Do not profane the German nation, the German firm or the German workshop by using foreign machines or implements.

V. Do not allow foreign meat to be served at your table. Using foreign meat is harmful to the German breeder. Besides, it may compromise your health, since foreign meats are not inspected by the German sanitary police.

VI. Write on German paper with a German pen, and use a German blotting pad.

VII. Wear only German clothes and German hats.

VIII. German flour, German fruits and German beer alone give German strength.

IX. Drink coffee which comes from German colonies. If you prefer cocoa or chocolate, see that they are exclusively of German manufacture.

X. Do not let the boasting of foreigners turn you from these wise precepts, and remember that the best products and the only ones worthy of a citizen of Great Germany are German products.

This is Protectionism pure and simple; sound, sane, intelligent and consistent Protectionism. Go over these "Ten Commandments," and wherever the words "German" or "Germany" occur, change them to "American" and "America." Then you will have a Protection decalogue that exactly fits your own country.

—From *American Economist*, Sept. 8, 1911.

THE AMERICAN PROTECTIVE TARIFF LEAGUE

was organized under the society laws of the state of New York in 1885. The object is explained by the second article of its constitution as follows :

The object of this League shall be to Protect American labor by a Tariff on imports, which shall adequately secure American Industrial products against the competition of foreign labor.

MEMBERSHIP IN THE AMERICAN PROTECTIVE TARIFF LEAGUE IS EXPLAINED BY THE FOLLOWING PLEDGE :

The undersigned hereby declares his devotion to American industrial independence and pledges himself to pay to The American Protective Tariff League annually the sum of One Hundred Dollars (or so much thereof as may be called for in any year by the Executive Committee), with the privilege of terminating this obligation by giving written notice to the General Secretary of the League on or before December 31st for each year thereafter.

THE AMERICAN ECONOMIST

published weekly by THE AMERICAN PROTECTIVE TARIFF LEAGUE, is the acknowledged authority on the Protective Tariff not only in the United States, but throughout the world.

Subscription price, Domestic, \$2.00 a year ; Foreign, \$2.50 a year.

ADDRESS:

AMERICAN PROTECTIVE TARIFF LEAGUE

No. 339 BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

THEY GOTTA QUIT KNOCKIN' THE TARIFF DOWN.

[THE OZARK "ZINC" SONG.]

Statesmen, when they get to town,
Start a kickin' the Tariff round;
They're runnin' it 'way into the ground;
They gotta quit knockin' the Tariff down.

They knock, and knock, and knock it 'round,
Ad valorem and by the pound;
Makes no diffrence tho' our doctrine's sound,
They gotta quit knockin' the Tariff down.

Business they are tryin' to drown,
With lies and arguments unsound;
The Tariff gives us 'nuff to go 'round;
They gotta quit knockin' the Tariff down.

Traitors to American ground,
Who treat their best friend like a hound,
Will sure get theirs in the rebound;
They'd better quit knockin' the Tariff down.

C. E. RICHARDSON.

WASHINGTON, Feb. 26, 1912.

From American Economist of March 8th, 1912.